

Today's Topics:

ARRL (2 msgs)
kiss for heath pocket packet?

Date: 20 Dec 89 14:08:48 GMT

From: pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!peregrine!ccicpg!cci632!dvh@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (David
Hallidy)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <32730@cci632.UUCP>

In article <536@idacrd.UUCP>, mac@idacrd.UUCP (Robert McGwier) writes:

> From article <5797@cps3xx.UUCP>, by usenet@cps3xx.UUCP (Usenet file owner):

> > should be for a general purpose organization. They are now changing
> > their tune where microwave coverage in QST is concerned. It is not
> > acceptable to ENTIRELY DROP microwave coverage from QST as they have
> > done. It is also not acceptable to shuttle microwave coverage off to
>

> It is also not acceptable for you to libel the League. If you will read
> the column "The World Above 50 Mhz", they clearly state a change in
> emphasis to INCLUDE Microwave coverage. Bill is an honest, hardworking
> valued member of the above 50 Mhz crowd and he would GLADLY include
> submissions to the column on topics of interest to Microwave. If you
> are unhappy that you are not getting a column per month is one thing,
> to say that you have NO coverage is demonstrably false.

>

> (Bill Tynan, W3X0 is a personal friend and a co-director of AMSAT with
> myself. I for one believe in stating all the facts so that you can
> make your own judgements on the content of my statements.)

>

> Bob

>

> -----
> My opinions are my own no matter | Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
> who I work for! ;-) | CCR, AMSAT, etc.

> -----

No one is arguing about the dedication or devotion to VHF/UHF related topics that OUR personal friend W3X0 has. He was told to cut his column size to "fit the new format" just as "The New Frontier" was also told it would no longer exist. Let's look at the facts. Since the change (which officially began with microwave "coverage" in "The World Above 50 MHz" in the November issue of QST) there have been EXACTLY 13 SENTENCES related to the frequencies above 450 MHz. Eleven in the November issue and TWO in December!!! Giving Bill the benefit of the doubt, it can be said

that it will take some time for people to start sending him their operating news, so there may be more of the type of coverage that was in the Nov and Dec issues in the future. BUT, Bill's column, as stated by Bill himself, is more geared to editorials and operating news than to technical items. "The New Frontier" was the microwave enthusiast's place to hear about timely happenings, both from an operating and a technical viewpoint, which Bill, with his limited charter and even more limited space, cannot do. No one is "libelling" the League. Your comments in this regard are specious. Bob, you should be as upset with the League's policy change as we microwavers are, because the future of the AMSAT program depends on Amateurs understanding how to use the frequencies above 1 GHz. I believe I can safely say that as Phase IV (and beyond) satellites are developed, there will be further emphasis on up/down links in the microwave bands. If hams don't feel they can adapt to the use of these frequencies for their satellite work, I dare say you'll have a tough time coming up with the funds to support these future birds.

To those who say that pulling out of the League is the wrong approach- that we should stay and fight, I say- I do plenty, with the limited time I can devote to this HOBBY. I am President of the Rochester VHF Group, I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Central States VHF Society, a past Vice-President and one of the founders of the North Texas Microwave Society, I run code and theory classes at lunchtime where I work, I build, and I am active on the air from all bands 160m through 3cm, with moonbounce capabilities on 902, 1296, 2304 and 3456 MHz. I'm not bragging, just trying to point out that I don't have a lot of time to get into another fight; so, I takes my marbles and goes home. In reality, with Bob Atkins move to Ham Radio Magazine imminent, that's where my limited bux will be spent.

I've spent too much time here, beating this already quite dead horse, but I felt compelled to add my \$.02 to the noise.

Dave KD5RO

Date: 20 Dec 89 15:24:58 GMT
From: pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!peregrine!ccicpg!cci632!dvh@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (David
Hallidy)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <32733@cci632.UUCP>

In article <7782@cbnewsm.ATT.COM>, rma@mhuxo.ATT.COM (atkins, robert m) writes:
> In article <321@ssc.UUCP>, tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook) writes:
> >

> >
> > Despite what N8DGN said, QST has not "TOTALLY CUT all microwave coverage",
> > just as they have not banned articles about CW, AMTOR. or mobile. They
> > stopped carrying a COLUMN on this subject.
> >
> > Check out the 1990 ARRL Handbook. There is LOTS of microwave material,
> > probably even out of proportion with current interest on the subject.
> > The Handbook hardly qualifies as a "special interest publication", unless
> > you consider amateur radio itself as "special interest".
> >
> The handbook does indeed contain some microwave material, and I am glad to
> see it. The ARRL have had manuscripts in hand for about 3 or 4 years now to
> produce a microwave manual. Authors have been paid (in part) for work submitted
> but we have no sign of any publication. They say (and have said for two years
> now) it will be out RSN (Real Soon Now). It is taking on the characteristics
> of Vaporware (often talked about but never seen). If they are not careful the
> ARRL are going to have a lot of outdated information in hand and will spend
> more money and time in a never ending effort to catch up with technological
> advances. You have to move with some speed if you intend to publish information
> in such a field.
> If the ARRL really want to encourage development of the microwave bands
> (which they say they do, and I want to believe them), then they must make
> microwave information available to the general membership, and that means
> exposure in QST. The ARRL is in a position to lead, but they have an
> inclination to follow. They can only be judged by their actions, not by their
> words. Look
> at a random issue of QST (Nov 89 and on). Are they actively supporting the
> development of the microwave bands? If not, then microwave experimenters may
> have to look elsewhere for such support.
>
> Bob Atkins, KA1GT

SOME authors have been partially paid. I, for one, have not. My article
was accepted for publication in the "Microwave Handbook" nearly two
years ago and it has gone no further than that. Others have received half
their pay, with the rest due on publication- this is standard, but many
of these articles were written 3-4 YEARS AGO. KK7B told me at Microwave
Update in Dallas in October that he doesn't want them to publish his
submissions because so much has changed since he wrote the articles. Many
(well, some) of us are threatening to pull our submissions out for
possible re-submission to Ham Radio. (I also was not required to sign
a release- some others did, some didn't). I agree that the Microwave
Handbook is "Vaporware". If and when it appears, it will be so outdated
that it won't even be representative of the stations of those who submitted
the articles on which it will be based.

Rinaldo's (QST editor) response to my letter expressing displeasure with the recent decisions to change the format of QST and the loss of real microwave coverage was a form letter, the content of which has been previously discussed here. Suffice to say, my decision to pull back my support for the League was not one made overnight. I have been a member for many years and have generally been supportive of ARRL positions. However, this one really has me torqued in the wrong direction. It is so obvious to me that we should be working to expose the bands above 1 GHz to the general Amateur public, that I can't understand why they could make a decision like the one they did. Therefore, in light of that decision, I remove my vocal and FINANCIAL support. When they deserve it again, they'll get it. If we all want to become members of TOFC (The Old Farts Club) hanging out on 20 or 75m and bitching about the weather and the QRM and the "damn space-cadets" (apologies to W20Y SK), then let's support the League in all its "wisdom". If we want to continue (or really, to start again) being at the forefront of communications technology, then we'd better wake the League up before it's too late and all we have left are 20 and 75m!

I really don't care how we use the microwave bands- be it weak signal, FM, Packet, ATV, Spread Spectrum, or anything else you can think of- BUT WE NEED TO USE THEM!!! The management of these pieces of spectrum is another issue, but much less important than our ability (or inability) to hold on to them.

'Nuff said. I'm off my soapbox now. I had promised myself I wouldn't ever post here again after some of the recent flaming, but I just couldn't ignore this thread- it's too important to the future of ham radio.

Dave KD5RO

Date: Thursday December 21, 1989, 1:02:51 p.m.
From: watmath!ria.ccs.uwo.ca!HAMSTER.business.uwo.ca!Mark@uunet.UU.NET
Subject: kiss for heath pocket packet?
Message-ID: <1105@HAMSTER.business.uwo.ca>

=====
Does any have an eprom image that supports kiss on the heath pocket packet tnc? I would like to use it with NOS on my laptop, however, it does not have KISS mode. I have a programmer if I could FTP the file from someplace.

=====

Mark Bramwell, VE3PZR (519) 661-3714 {UWO}
BITNET: mbramwel@uwo.ca Packet: VE3PZR @ VE3GYQ

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1053
